

LaPointe further noted the MAO received approximately 76 individual letters and petitions in opposition to the proposal, and Bieraugel's petition containing 3,000 signatures.¹⁰⁴ He found that nearly all the responses and certainly the petitions failed to give any documentation or other specific evidentiary support for their opposition.¹⁰⁵ To him, this opposition evidence indicated possible future conflict with the local community, but not grounds to reject the proposal.

LaPointe also observed that the MAO received responses from 11 Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and that nine out of 11 were emphatically against the proposal. He analyzed the objections as economic and political. He found that most of the tribes expressed opposition based on the potential impact on their gaming operations, but gave no hard evidence to support the claim that a Hudson casino would result in a reduction in their revenues. Specifically, he stated that in the absence of evidence provided by the tribes that they would be "devastat[ed] economically," he placed great weight on the reports by Arthur Andersen and Dr. James Murray furnished by the applicants.¹⁰⁶ While he thought the proposed casino might have an impact on

¹⁰⁴LaPointe also stated in his findings that he made no effort to verify the signatures on the petitions submitted for and against the Hudson proposal. He suggested that the petitions be directed to the Governor.

¹⁰⁵The sole exception that LaPointe acknowledged was the letter submitted by William Cranmer, a local resident opposed to the casino application. LaPointe's review included not only the materials that had previously been received in response to the MAO's official solicitation, but also letters and petitions which continued to arrive during LaPointe's work on the application. LaPointe did not enforce any cut-off date for the submission of relevant information; any information received prior to the MAO recommendation was considered, and information received afterwards was forwarded to the IGMS.

¹⁰⁶MAO's Recommended Findings of Fact and Conclusions, Nov. 15, 1994, at 23. The applicants provided to the MAO, along with their financial and real estate agreements, two
(continued...)